

1 **Both HFrEF and HFpEF Should be Included in Calculating**
2 **CHA2DS2–VASc score: a Taiwanese Longitudinal Cohort**

3

4 **Running title: Heart failure subtype in CHA2DS2–VASc Score**

5

6 Chien-Chien Cheng^a, Pang-Shuo Huang, MD^{c,d,e}, Jien-Jiun Chen, MD^c, Fu-Chun Chiu,
7 MD^c, Sheng-Nan Chang, MD, PhD^c, Yi-Chih Wang, MD, PhD^b, Cho-Kai Wu, MD,
8 PhD^b, Juey-Jen Hwang, MD, PhD^b, , Chia-Ti Tsai, MD, PhD^b

9

10 ^a National Taiwan University College of Medicine, Taipei, Taiwan

11 ^bDivision of Cardiology, Department of Internal Medicine, National Taiwan University
12 Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan

13 ^cDivision of Cardiology, Department of Internal Medicine, National Taiwan University
14 Hospital Yun-Lin Branch, Yun-Lin, Taiwan

15 ^dGraduate Institute of Clinical Medicine, College of Medicine, National Taiwan
16 University, Taipei, Taiwan

17 ^eCardiovascular Center, National Taiwan University Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan

18 **Address for correspondence:**

19 Chia-Ti Tsai, MD, PhD, Division of Cardiology, Department of Internal Medicine,

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

1 National Taiwan University College of Medicine and Hospital No. 7, Chung-Shan

2 South Road, Taipei 100, Taiwan. Phone: 886-2-23123456. Fax: 886-2-82317099.

3 E-mail: cttsai1999@gmail.com

4

5 **Author Contributions**

6 C-CC: study design, analyses, conducting, and manuscript preparation; P-SH:

7 study design, analyses, and manuscript revision; J-J C, F-CC, S-NC, Y-CW, C-KW,

8 J-JH: Conceived and designed the study; C-TT: study design, analyses, and

9 manuscript preparation. All authors contributed to the article and approved the

10 submitted version.

11

12 **Acknowledgments**

13 The authors thank all the participating individuals for their contribution to this

14 study. The authors would like to express their thanks to the staff of Department of

15 Medical Research for providing clinical data from National Taiwan University

16 Hospital-integrated Medical Database (NTUH-iMD).

17

18 **Conflict of Interest**

19 The authors have nothing to disclose.

1

2 **Data Availability**

3 Restrictions apply to the availability of some or all data generated or analyzed
4 during this study to preserve patient confidentiality or because they were used under
5 license. The corresponding author will on request detail the restrictions and any
6 conditions under which access to some data may be provided.

7

8 **Funding statement**

9 This work was partially supported by a grant from the National Science and
10 Technology Council (110-2314-B-002-198-MY3).

11

12

1 **Both HFrEF and HFpEF Should be Included in Calculating**

2 **CHA2DS2–VASc score: a Taiwanese Longitudinal Cohort**

3

4 **Running title: Heart failure subtype in CHA2DS2–VASc Score**

5

6 Total word count: 3424

7 Figure number: 2

8 Table number: 3

9

1

Abstract

2 Background

3 Congestive heart failure (CHF) in the context of AF-related stroke risk, was coined
4 when it mainly referred to patients with left ventricular systolic dysfunction (HFrEF).
5 However, the term now encompasses patients with preserved ejection fraction
6 (HFpEF) as well. Given this change, it becomes essential to investigate the variation
7 in stroke risk between atrial fibrillation (AF) patients with HFpEF and HFrEF for
8 enhancing risk assessment and subsequent management strategies.

9

10 Methods

11 In a longitudinal study utilizing the National Taiwan University Hospital Integrated
12 Medical Database (iMED), 8358 patients with AF were followed up for 10 years from
13 January 2010 to December 2020 (mean follow-up 3.76 years). The study evaluated
14 the risk of ischemic stroke, using Cox models adjusted for potential risk factors of
15 AF-related stroke.

16

17 Results

18 Comparing AF patients of different CHF subgroups, HFpEF patients had a higher
19 mean CHA₂DS₂-VASc score (4.08±1.502 vs. 3.83±1.571, p<0.001) and a higher risk

1 of stroke during follow-up (HR 1.151 (1.013-1.308), $p=0.031$). In contrast, patients
2 with HFrEF had a higher prevalence of myocardial infarction (MI) and coronary
3 artery disease (CAD). After adjusting for other risk factors, there was no significant
4 difference in the risk of new-onset stroke between HFpEF and HFrEF patients (HR
5 1.001 (0.877-1.142), $p=0.994$).

6

7 Conclusion

8 After adjusting for other risk factors of stroke, both HFpEF and HFrEF were found to
9 have a similar risk of stroke in AF patients. Therefore, it is important to extend the
10 criteria for "C" in the CHA2DS2–VASc score to include HFpEF patients. Prior to
11 multivariable adjustment, HFpEF patients had a higher risk than those with HFrEF,
12 likely due to their higher CHA2DS2–VASc score, indicating a greater prevalence of
13 stroke-related comorbidities.

14

15 Keywords: Atrial fibrillation, HFrEF, HFpEF, CHA2DS2–VASc score, Ischemic
16 stroke

1 **Introduction**

2 Atrial fibrillation (AF) has become the most prevalent cardiac arrhythmic disease,
3 and its prevalence is continuing to rise, in part due to the aging population. AF is
4 associated with multiple comorbidities, including up to five-fold increased risk of
5 ischemic stroke(1). Congestive heart failure (CHF) has been a growing concern due to
6 an aging population, with an annual incidence of 177 per 100,000 people in Taiwan
7 (2). Potential risk factors of CHF include coronary artery disease (CAD), valvular
8 heart disease, myocardial infarction (MI), and AF. Frequently coexisting, CHF has
9 also been known to predispose AF, and vice versa, further acting as a risk factor of
10 stroke development in this population.

11 When predicting stroke incidence in AF patients, current guidelines recommend
12 utilizing the CHA2DS2–VASc score, a convenient risk stratification instrument for
13 stroke risk in AF patients (3, 4). It is widely utilized as it incorporates mostly known
14 patient history and characteristics, including CHF. Nevertheless, as the understanding
15 of CHF advances, the term is no longer limited to patients with reduced ejection
16 fraction (HFrEF), and is now defined as a clinical syndrome with classic signs or
17 symptoms caused by a cardiac abnormality(5). Although this definition includes a
18 subset of patients with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF), an entity commonly
19 defined as LVEF \geq 50%, HFpEF itself is not sufficient to fulfill the “C” criterion in

1 current AF management guidelines. Interestingly, according to a survey conducted by
2 the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) Scientific Initiatives Committee on
3 the interpretation of CHA2DS2-VASc score components in clinical practice, the “C”
4 component was among those difficult to score. This reflects a knowledge gap in
5 current scoring systems, as inconsistencies exist for similar terminology. Therefore,
6 further exploration of the impact of HFpEF is needed for clarity of diagnosis
7 definition.

8 Atrial fibrillation has been shown to be more prevalent in HFpEF patients (6, 7),
9 and the two phenotypes to some extent have an interdependent relationship clinically
10 and epidemiologically (8). Nevertheless, studies have also shown no difference in the
11 development of HFpEF versus HFrEF in AF patients (9), and the impact of ejection
12 fraction and occurrence of ischemic stroke is controversial.

13 The CHA2DS2–VASc score was developed prior to the introduction of a
14 broadened scope of heart failure subtypes and the role of HFpEF in this setting is
15 ambiguous(10). Patients with HFpEF have been shown to have a higher score, and
16 when compared to HFrEF patients, are at a greater risk of developing stroke and
17 systemic embolism (11). Despite the aforementioned advances, the impact of
18 coexisting risk factors has not been clarified. This study aims to delineate the impact
19 of HFpEF versus HFrEF with patient comorbidities taken into consideration.

1 **Methods**

2 **Study population**

3 This retrospective, cross-sectional study took place at National Taiwan University
4 Hospital (NTUH), a tertiary medical center in Taiwan. Data from both the NTUH
5 Integrated Medical Database (NTUH-IMD) and reimbursement claim records from
6 the Taiwan national health insurance program at NTUH were used for the study. To
7 ensure data accuracy and integrity, chart reviews were conducted as necessary to
8 supplement the information obtained from the NTUH-IMD. The study period spanned
9 from January 2010 to December 2020.

10 The study protocol received approval from the Research Ethics Committee of the
11 NTUH, and informed consent was waived given the retrospective nature of the study.
12 Patient data with any identifying information was accessible only to the investigators
13 and kept confidential in accordance with the approved protocol 200911002R and
14 202011019RINC. During the study period, an AF cohort was formed using a common
15 criterion, which required at least three outpatient claims within a year or at least one
16 inpatient claim coded for AF (ICD9-CM codes 427.31) in the first three or five
17 diagnostic codes, respectively. No restrictions were imposed on age or other
18 parameters in this cohort. HFpEF was defined as patients with a left ventricular
19 ejection fraction (LVEF) of 55% or higher, while HFrEF was defined as patients with

1 an LVEF below 55%.

2 8358 patients with atrial fibrillation (AF) were followed up for 10 years (mean
3 follow-up 3.76 years, median follow-up time 3.21 years). Among these patients, 4654
4 (55.7%) had no history of CHF, 2374 (28.4%) had HFpEF, and 1330 (15.9%) had
5 HFrEF.

6 The study aimed to assess the risk of thromboembolic events, specifically
7 ischemic stroke, in the HFpEF population and compare it with traditional HFrEF
8 populations among AF patients.

9

10 **Statistical analysis**

11 Continuous data were presented as mean \pm standard deviation (SD). Independent
12 two-sample Student's t-test was used for comparing continuous variables, while the
13 chi-square test was employed for categorical variables. The time to the first event of
14 ischemic stroke was illustrated using the Kaplan–Meier survival function estimation.
15 Survival curve differences were tested using log-rank statistics.

16 For identifying predictors (specifically HFpEF and HFrEF and other components
17 of CHA2DS2–VASc score) of incident ischemic stroke, multivariable Cox
18 proportional-hazards regression analysis was performed, and hazard ratios (HRs) with
19 corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated.

- 1 All statistical tests were two-sided, and a significance level of $p < 0.05$ was
- 2 considered statistically significant. The statistical analyses were carried out using
- 3 SPSS 25.0 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY).

1 **Results**

2 **Baseline characteristics**

3 The baseline characteristics of the study participants are shown in Table 1.

4 Comparing AF patients without CHF, with HFpEF, or with HFrEF, we found that

5 patients with HFpEF were oldest, more female, and had a higher prevalence of

6 previous stroke and hypertension. They also had a higher mean CHA₂DS₂-VASc

7 score (4.08 ± 1.502 vs. 3.83 ± 1.571 vs. 2.52 ± 1.513 , $p < 0.001$). In contrast, patients with

8 HFrEF were younger and had a higher prevalence of MI and CAD, likely due to an

9 ischemic cardiomyopathy etiology.

1 **HFpEF patients had a higher risk of developing ischemic stroke when compared**
2 **to HFrEF patients during long-term follow-up**

3

4 A total of 2049 new-onset strokes occurred during long-term follow-up (Table 1).

5 Comparing patients with CHF to those without (Table 2), as expected, patients with

6 CHF were more likely to have an attack of ischemic stroke (HR 1.358 (1.245-1.481),

7 $p < 0.001$). Further stratifying these patients according to ejection fraction, we found

8 that patients with HFpEF had a higher risk of stroke than those with HFrEF (HR

9 1.425 vs 1.238). The risk of stroke development was significantly higher in HFpEF

10 patients (HR 1.151 (1.013-1.308), $p = 0.031$, with HFrEF as reference).

11 Kaplan-Meier curves of patients with no CHF, HFrEF, and HFpEF

12 redemonstrated the significant difference in ischemic stroke rates between the three

13 groups. We found that HFpEF patients had the highest stroke rate during follow-up,

14 compared to both HFrEF patients and patients without CHF (Figure 1).

15

1 **No difference in stroke risk between different subtypes of heart failure after**
2 **adjustment for other risk factors**

3

4 Because HFpEF patients had a higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc score or more
5 comorbidities compared to HFrEF patients, it was possible that these risk factors
6 might be confounding factors when evaluating ischemic stroke risk. We used Cox
7 regression model to evaluate the stroke risks in different CHF subgroups to adjust for
8 these risk factors.

9 After adjustment for other risk factors of stroke (components of CHA₂DS₂-
10 VASc score including female sex, age, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, previous
11 stroke, CAD, MI, and peripheral arterial disease), the risk of stroke between HFpEF
12 and HFrEF was not significantly different (HR 1.001 (0.877-1.142), p=0.994, with
13 HFrEF as reference). Among various known risk factors, history of stroke was
14 associated with the highest increase in stroke incidence, with over 13-fold, followed
15 by hypertension, with only 1.46-fold increasing risk (Table 3).

16 Dividing patients with CHF into three categories in regards to their CHA₂DS₂-
17 VASc score, specifically with scores of 0-2, 3-5, and >5, we found that in each
18 subgroup, there was no difference in ischemic stroke rate between CHF subtypes.
19 Notably, over half of the patients were categorized in scores of 3-5, in which the

- 1 Kaplan-Meier curves were closest ($p=0.853$) (Figure 2.)
- 2 Our results show that both HFpEF and HFrEF were risk factors for stroke
- 3 development in AF patients, and when taking into consideration other risk factors
- 4 contributing to an ischemic stroke event, the two subtypes carry comparable increased
- 5 risk.

1 **Discussion**

2 This study represents the first long-term follow-up investigation comparing the
3 roles of HFrEF and HFpEF in contributing to ischemic stroke risk in patients with AF
4 in the Asia-Pacific region, and potentially worldwide.

5 In this real-world longitudinal follow-up study of AF patients with no CHF,
6 HFpEF, or HFrEF, both HFpEF and HFrEF were associated with a higher risk of
7 stroke. Specifically, HFpEF showed a greater risk when compared to HFrEF (HR
8 1.151 (1.013-1.308), $p=0.031$). Interestingly, we also observed a higher prevalence of
9 previous stroke history in HFpEF patients compared to those with no CHF and
10 HFrEF.

11 However, after conducting a multivariable analysis, the difference in stroke risk
12 between HFpEF and HFrEF patients was no longer significant, and both groups
13 exhibited around a 1.2-fold increased risk in stroke development. This was
14 redemonstrated upon subgrouping patients in regards to their CHA₂DS₂-VASc score,
15 with no difference in ischemic stroke risk between CHF subtypes in each subgroup.

16 The disparity in results before and after multivariable analysis could be attributed
17 to the higher mean CHA₂DS₂-VASc score observed in HFpEF patients at the time of
18 enrollment. This group of patients also had a greater prevalence of pro-inflammatory
19 and metabolic comorbidities, such as diabetes mellitus and hypertension.

1 To the best of our knowledge, this study represents the longest follow-up
2 investigation assessing the impact of different CHF subtypes in East Asian AF
3 patients. Notably, our study cohort includes the largest number of CHF patients
4 among Asian studies focusing on this subject.

5

6 **Development of CHA2DS2–VASc score**

7 Current guidelines recommend the use of the CHA2DS2–VASc score as a risk
8 stratification tool for predicting stroke risk and determining the need for anticoagulant
9 therapy in patients with AF (3, 12, 13). Patients are categorized using a clinical
10 evaluation approach that involves scoring based on the presence of several
11 well-documented risk factors. The letter "C" in the CHA2DS2–VASc score represents
12 congestive heart failure. As per the 2020 ESC guidelines, this includes clinical heart
13 failure, encompassing those with recent decompensated heart failure regardless of
14 ejection fraction, objective evidence of moderate to severe left ventricular dysfunction
15 irrespective of symptoms, and hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (HCM) (3).

16 The criteria for the CHA2DS2-VASc score were initially defined and developed
17 at a time when heart failure mainly referred to patients with reduced LVEF or left
18 ventricular systolic dysfunction. However, it remains unclear and a continuous subject
19 of debate whether these criteria are applicable to patients with HFpEF. In other words,

1 it is uncertain whether the "C" in the CHA2DS2-VASc score should also be
2 considered for this specific population. Further research is needed to address this
3 question and provide clarity on the matter.

4 The CHA2DS2–VASc score is based on its predecessor, the CHADS2 score,
5 further incorporating vascular disease, age of over 65 years old, and sex as modifying
6 factors(14). Notably, the development of CHADS2 score was based on previous
7 scoring models as well, derived from the Atrial Fibrillation Investigators (AFI) and
8 the stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation (SPAF) trial. Information on the former was
9 collected from five other trials, each with slightly different definitions of heart failure
10 in their cohort, with none including data on ejection fraction(15). Current CHA2DS2–
11 VASc score used the Euro Heart Survey on the AF population as their validation
12 group, which defined heart failure as the “Onset of new heart failure, or worsening of
13 known heart failure” (16, 17). Importantly, the term “heart failure” did not have a
14 consistent definition, and data on LVEF was not included in these trials(10).

15 2022 AHA/ACC/HFSA Guideline for the Management of Heart Failure defines
16 HFpEF as LVEF \geq 50%, with evidence of spontaneous or provokable increased LV
17 filling pressures. Therefore, the presence of HFpEF without recent decompensation is
18 not sufficient to meet the “C” criteria of the CHA2DS2–VASc score and require
19 further clinical symptoms. This may be difficult to interpret as many HFpEF patients

1 show hemodynamic abnormalities only during stress tests (18, 19). On the other hand,
2 HFrEF itself is a guaranteed fulfillment of the condition. Our results show HFpEF and
3 HFrEF have a similar increased risk in ischemic stroke after multivariable
4 adjustments, thus both groups of patients may contain substantial thromboembolic
5 risk.

6 The impact of ejection fraction on stroke risk has been an area of debate, with
7 varying results. Banerjee et al. conducted a retrospective analysis of CHF patients
8 with AF. Their findings revealed no significant difference in stroke incidence between
9 AF patients with HFrEF and HFpEF, even after multivariable analysis. These results
10 align with a recent meta-analysis on a similar topic, indicating that the stroke risk
11 remains consistent across both CHF subtypes (20, 21). Another meta-analysis
12 specifically investigating cardiovascular events in patients with AF found no
13 significant difference in the occurrence of ischemic stroke between patients with
14 HFpEF and HFrEF (22). These findings were replicated in a study conducted with
15 Japanese patients hospitalized for CHF, which also produced similar results (23).
16 However, a study by McManus et al. demonstrated that pre-existing AF increased the
17 risk of ischemic stroke specifically in patients with HFpEF (24). Recent data from a
18 multicenter Korean registry supported these findings, revealing that the risks of
19 ischemic stroke and thromboembolism were significantly higher in patients with

1 HFpEF compared to those with HFrEF and heart failure with mid-range ejection
2 fraction (HFmrEF) (11, 25).

3 This discordance in literature findings may be a result of several factors. Firstly,
4 compared to previous studies with conflicting results, our CHF cohort consisted of a
5 considerable number of patients, and the average follow-up duration was longer. As
6 the effects of chronic underlying conditions may become significant in time, an
7 extended follow-up time may be more beneficial in the observation of relevant risk
8 factors. Compared to most studies, our study cohort had a greater proportion of
9 HFpEF patients, which might have included patients in the lower severity spectrum.
10 Recent studies show HFpEF patients compose the majority of heart failure patients
11 and account for over 70% of elderly patients(26). The prevalence of AF is also seen to
12 linearly increase with ejection fraction in patients hospitalized for acute CHF (27). As
13 most registries include predominantly elderly patients, a lower number of HFpEF
14 patients might have been biased with the exclusion of less severe patients, thus
15 resulting in a worse prognosis. Furthermore, the cutoff value for HFpEF and HFrEF
16 was 55% in our study, more stringent than most studies. In the 2016 ESC/Heart
17 Failure Association (HFA) guidelines, $LVEF \leq 40\%$ is categorized as HFrEF, whereas
18 $LVEF \geq 50\%$ is grouped as HFpEF(28). The grey area between HFpEF and HFrEF is
19 referred to as HFmrEF. In the aforementioned studies, HFmrEF was found to pose

1 less of a risk in stroke development compared HFpEF patients(11). Recent literature
2 also showed similar stroke risk when using 40% and 50% as cutoff points for HFpEF
3 and HFrEF patients (23). Furthermore, studies on heart failure patients showed
4 HFmrEF patients to be responsive to therapies proven effective in HFrEF patients,
5 suggesting the former may be a milder form of the latter (29, 30). Despite the above
6 evidence, the possible inclusion of potential HFpEF patients in the HFrEF group only
7 further strengthens our hypothesis, and is in line with our findings.

8

9 **Underlying comorbidities related to stroke**

10 When compared to patients without CHF, both HFrEF and HFpEF had a higher
11 prevalence of stroke-related risk factors and a higher incidence of stroke. This
12 highlights the fact that regardless of the ejection fraction group, CHF itself is a risk
13 factor for stroke. In fact, heart failure in non-arrhythmic patients is known to increase
14 stroke incidence. Adelborg, Kasper et al. reported 1.5-to-2.1-fold increased risk of
15 ischemic stroke in heart failure patients compared to those without during 30 years of
16 follow-up in a population-based study (31). This was evident after adjustment for
17 several risk factors including age, sex, and related comorbidities. Various studies
18 show similar results, substantiating the relation (32, 33). Nevertheless, the direct
19 cause and effect remain a topic of debate, as patients with CHF often carry multiple

1 risk factors associated with stroke including hypertension, obesity, and diabetes
2 mellitus.

3 While originally thought to be a spectrum of heart failure severity, HFpEF and
4 HFrEF are now considered as two separate phenotypes, differing in risk factors,
5 disease course, and management (34). Although sharing a portion of overlapping risk
6 factors, HFrEF and HFpEF have also been shown to have differing predisposing
7 conditions, with the former being a result of myocardial loss, and the latter commonly
8 burdened with longstanding extra-cardiac comorbidities such as hypertension, type 2
9 DM, and older age (35). This difference is reflected in our cohort in which a
10 prominent number of HFrEF patients with a history of MI and CAD, and a higher
11 prevalence of hypertension in HFpEF patients.

12 Non-cardiac comorbidities are common in CHF patients, with past reports of up
13 to 84% of HFrEF and 94% HFpEF patients with at least one (36). Notably, a higher
14 prevalence of comorbidity burden has been shown in HFpEF patients of Asian
15 ethnicity compared to their Western counterpart (37). Our study revealed a different
16 patient profile in HFrEF and HFpEF groups, with the latter more predominately
17 female, older, and hypertensive, as well as an overall higher mean CHA₂DS₂-VASc
18 score. This was similar to previous reports in HFpEF patients with AF(11, 20, 22).
19 Patient characteristics in our study are also comparable to previous reports in heart

1 failure patients irrespective of arrhythmic state, which showed HFpEF patients to be
2 predominantly female, older, and more often hypertensive(30, 38, 39). Indeed,
3 evidence from cardiac structural changes in HFpEF patients have led to the hypothesis
4 that hypertensive pressure overload and aging plays a major role in disease
5 development in this groups of patients (40, 41, 42). Age, female sex and hypertension
6 are notorious risk factors for stroke, and the increased prevalence of these conditions
7 may indicate a greater benefit from anticoagulation therapy in this group.

8 In our cohort, the prevalence of MI and CAD were higher in the HFrEF group.
9 This observation might be attributed to a shared etiology of post-MI and ischemic
10 cardiomyopathy in this particular group. In contrast to HFpEF, in which development
11 is attributable to chronic comorbidities, HFrEF has been shown to result from a
12 distinct pathophysiological event, leading to a substantial and acute loss of myocytes,
13 for example, myocardial infarction (35). Indeed, this is somewhat compatible with the
14 previous results of Kamon, Daisuke et al., which showed 59% of AMI patients
15 re-hospitalized for heart failure to have a LVEF of lower than 50%(43). Previous
16 reports based on both AF and non-AF cohorts have consistently demonstrated a higher
17 prevalence of MI and CAD in patients with HFrEF (11, 30, 36, 38). This may have
18 contributed to the predominance of males in the HFrEF group as these patients may
19 have had a greater risk of MI development (44). Overall, the complexity of heart

1 failure patients plays a role in thromboembolic development, further contributing to
2 mortality rates, and should also be taken into consideration in management.

3

4 **Limitations**

5 This study was a longitudinal hospital-based investigation that recruited AF
6 patients from a medical center, which might introduce inherent bias. Additionally, the
7 treatment of heart failure in our patients could have influenced left ventricular
8 function, further improving LVEF, thus potentially altering their CHF status during
9 the follow-up period. Unfortunately, this aspect was not accounted for in the analysis.
10 Moreover, although anticoagulant use was aligned with current guidelines, it was not
11 stratified in our analysis and could have impacted the outcome of stroke.

12 Anticoagulant usage in our overall cohort was around 30%, which may have
13 indicated a suboptimal prescription, influencing ischemic stroke rate. Nevertheless, as
14 prevalence was similar across the three groups, it is unlikely that anticoagulation had
15 a significant influence on our results.

16

17 **Conclusions**

18 In conclusion, both HFrEF and HFpEF are risk factors for stroke in AF patients and
19 should both be considered as “C” in the CHA2DS2–VASc score. With varying

1 underlying patient characteristics, disparate management considerations for the two
2 groups should be examined.

3

4

5 **References**

- 6 1. Wolf PA, Abbott RD, Kannel WB. Atrial fibrillation as an independent risk factor
7 for stroke: the Framingham Study. *Stroke*. 1991;22(8):983-8.
- 8 2. Wang TD, Huang ST, Wang CY, Lin FJ, Chen HM, Hsiao FY. Nationwide trends in
9 incidence, healthcare utilization, and mortality in hospitalized heart failure patients
10 in Taiwan. *ESC Heart Fail*. 2020;7(6):3653-66.
- 11 3. Hindricks G, Potpara T, Dagres N, Arbelo E, Bax JJ, Blomström-Lundqvist C, et al.
12 2020 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of atrial fibrillation
13 developed in collaboration with the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic
14 Surgery (EACTS): The Task Force for the diagnosis and management of atrial
15 fibrillation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) Developed with the special
16 contribution of the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) of the ESC. *Eur Heart
17 J*. 2021;42(5):373-498.
- 18 4. January CT, Wann LS, Calkins H, Chen LY, Cigarroa JE, Cleveland JC, Jr., et al. 2019
19 AHA/ACC/HRS Focused Update of the 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the
20 Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of
21 Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and
22 the Heart Rhythm Society. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;74(1):104-32.
- 23 5. Ponikowski P, Voors AA, Anker SD, Bueno H, Cleland JG, Coats AJ, et al. 2016 ESC
24 Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure: The
25 Task Force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure of the
26 European Society of Cardiology (ESC). Developed with the special contribution of the
27 Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur J Heart Fail*. 2016;18(8):891-975.
- 28 6. Sartipy U, Dahlström U, Fu M, Lund LH. Atrial Fibrillation in Heart Failure With
29 Preserved, Mid-Range, and Reduced Ejection Fraction. *JACC Heart Fail*.
30 2017;5(8):565-74.
- 31 7. Zafrir B, Lund LH, Laroche C, Ruschitzka F, Crespo-Leiro MG, Coats AJS, et al.
32 Prognostic implications of atrial fibrillation in heart failure with reduced, mid-range,
33 and preserved ejection fraction: a report from 14 964 patients in the European

- 1 Society of Cardiology Heart Failure Long-Term Registry. *Eur Heart J*.
2 2018;39(48):4277-84.
- 3 8. Packer M, Lam CSP, Lund LH, Redfield MM. Interdependence of Atrial Fibrillation
4 and Heart Failure With a Preserved Ejection Fraction Reflects a Common Underlying
5 Atrial and Ventricular Myopathy. *Circulation*. 2020;141(1):4-6.
- 6 9. Nicoli CD, O'Neal WT, Levitan EB, Singleton MJ, Judd SE, Howard G, et al. Atrial
7 fibrillation and risk of incident heart failure with reduced versus preserved ejection
8 fraction. *Heart*. 2022;108(5):353-9.
- 9 10. Mulder BA, van Veldhuisen DJ, Rienstra M. What should the C ('congestive heart
10 failure') represent in the CHA(2) DS(2) -VASc score? *Eur J Heart Fail*.
11 2020;22(8):1294-7.
- 12 11. Uhm JS, Kim J, Yu HT, Kim TH, Lee SR, Cha MJ, et al. Stroke and systemic
13 embolism in patients with atrial fibrillation and heart failure according to heart
14 failure type. *ESC Heart Fail*. 2021;8(2):1582-9.
- 15 12. January CT, Wann LS, Calkins H, Chen LY, Cigarroa JE, Cleveland JC, et al. 2019
16 AHA/ACC/HRS Focused Update of the 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the
17 Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of
18 Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and
19 the Heart Rhythm Society. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*.
20 2019;74(1):104-32.
- 21 13. Chiang C-E, Chao T-F, Choi E-K, Lim TW, Krittayaphong R, Li M, et al. Stroke
22 Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation. *JACC: Asia*. 2022;2(4):395-411.
- 23 14. Oladiran O, Nwosu I. Stroke risk stratification in atrial fibrillation: a review of
24 common risk factors. *J Community Hosp Intern Med Perspect*. 2019;9(2):113-20.
- 25 15. Risk factors for stroke and efficacy of antithrombotic therapy in atrial fibrillation.
26 Analysis of pooled data from five randomized controlled trials. *Arch Intern Med*.
27 1994;154(13):1449-57.
- 28 16. Nieuwlaat R, Prins MH, Le Heuzey J-Y, Vardas PE, Aliot E, Santini M, et al.
29 Prognosis, disease progression, and treatment of atrial fibrillation patients during 1
30 year: follow-up of the Euro Heart Survey on Atrial Fibrillation. *European Heart*
31 *Journal*. 2008;29(9):1181-9.
- 32 17. Lip GYH, Nieuwlaat R, Pisters R, Lane DA, Crijns HJGM. Refining Clinical Risk
33 Stratification for Predicting Stroke and Thromboembolism in Atrial Fibrillation Using a
34 Novel Risk Factor-Based Approach: The Euro Heart Survey on Atrial Fibrillation. *Chest*.
35 2010;137(2):263-72.
- 36 18. Obokata M, Kane GC, Reddy YN, Olson TP, Melenovsky V, Borlaug BA. Role of
37 Diastolic Stress Testing in the Evaluation for Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection
38 Fraction: A Simultaneous Invasive-Echocardiographic Study. *Circulation*.

- 1 2017;135(9):825-38.
- 2 19. Borlaug BA, Nishimura RA, Sorajja P, Lam CS, Redfield MM. Exercise
3 hemodynamics enhance diagnosis of early heart failure with preserved ejection
4 fraction. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2010;3(5):588-95.
- 5 20. Banerjee A, Taillandier S, Olesen JB, Lane DA, Lallemand B, Lip GYH, et al.
6 Ejection fraction and outcomes in patients with atrial fibrillation and heart failure:
7 the Loire Valley Atrial Fibrillation Project. *European Journal of Heart Failure*.
8 2012;14(3):295-301.
- 9 21. Vaz I, Tangri A, Ceron C, Rivner H, Singh H, Marzouka GR. STROKE RISK IN HEART
10 FAILURE AND ATRIAL FIBRILLATION - DOES EJECTION FRACTION MATTER? *Journal of*
11 *the American College of Cardiology*. 2022;79(9_Supplement):448-.
- 12 22. Kotecha D, Chudasama R, Lane DA, Kirchhof P, Lip GY. Atrial fibrillation and heart
13 failure due to reduced versus preserved ejection fraction: A systematic review and
14 meta-analysis of death and adverse outcomes. *Int J Cardiol*. 2016;203:660-6.
- 15 23. Sobue Y, Watanabe E, Lip GYH, Koshikawa M, Ichikawa T, Kawai M, et al.
16 Thromboembolisms in atrial fibrillation and heart failure patients with a preserved
17 ejection fraction (HFpEF) compared to those with a reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF).
18 *Heart Vessels*. 2018;33(4):403-12.
- 19 24. McManus DD, Hsu G, Sung SH, Saczynski JS, Smith DH, Magid DJ, et al. Atrial
20 Fibrillation and Outcomes in Heart Failure With Preserved Versus Reduced Left
21 Ventricular Ejection Fraction. *Journal of the American Heart Association*.
22 2013;2(1):e005694.
- 23 25. Chung S, Kim TH, Uhm JS, Cha MJ, Lee JM, Park J, et al. Stroke and Systemic
24 Embolism and Other Adverse Outcomes of Heart Failure With Preserved and
25 Reduced Ejection Fraction in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation (from the COmparison
26 study of Drugs for symptom control and complication prEvention of Atrial Fibrillation
27 [CODE-AF]). *Am J Cardiol*. 2020;125(1):68-75.
- 28 26. Pfeffer MA, Shah AM, Borlaug BA. Heart Failure With Preserved Ejection
29 Fraction In Perspective. *Circ Res*. 2019;124(11):1598-617.
- 30 27. Son MK, Park JJ, Lim NK, Kim WH, Choi DJ. Impact of atrial fibrillation in patients
31 with heart failure and reduced, mid-range or preserved ejection fraction. *Heart*.
32 2020;106(15):1160-8.
- 33 28. Ponikowski P, Voors AA, Anker SD, Bueno H, Cleland JGF, Coats AJS, et al. 2016
34 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure:
35 The Task Force for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure of
36 the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) Developed with the special contribution of
37 the Heart Failure Association (HFA) of the ESC. *Eur Heart J*. 2016;37(27):2129-200.
- 38 29. Lund LH, Claggett B, Liu J, Lam CS, Jhund PS, Rosano GM, et al. Heart failure with

- 1 mid-range ejection fraction in CHARM: characteristics, outcomes and effect of
- 2 candesartan across the entire ejection fraction spectrum. *Eur J Heart Fail.*
- 3 2018;20(8):1230-9.
- 4 30. Solomon SD, Claggett B, Lewis EF, Desai A, Anand I, Sweitzer NK, et al. Influence
- 5 of ejection fraction on outcomes and efficacy of spironolactone in patients with heart
- 6 failure with preserved ejection fraction. *Eur Heart J.* 2016;37(5):455-62.
- 7 31. Adelborg K, Szépligeti S, Sundbøll J, Horváth-Puhó E, Henderson VW, Ording A,
- 8 et al. Risk of Stroke in Patients With Heart Failure: A Population-Based 30-Year Cohort
- 9 Study. *Stroke.* 2017;48(5):1161-8.
- 10 32. Kannel WB, Wolf PA, Verter J. Manifestations of coronary disease predisposing
- 11 to stroke. The Framingham study. *Jama.* 1983;250(21):2942-6.
- 12 33. Berger JS, Peterson E, Laliberté F, Germain G, Lejeune D, Schein J, et al. Risk of
- 13 Ischemic Stroke in Patients Newly Diagnosed With Heart Failure: Focus on Patients
- 14 Without Atrial Fibrillation. *Journal of Cardiac Failure.* 2019;25(6):436-47.
- 15 34. Borlaug BA, Redfield MM. Diastolic and systolic heart failure are distinct
- 16 phenotypes within the heart failure spectrum. *Circulation.* 2011;123(18):2006-13;
- 17 discussion 14.
- 18 35. Simmonds SJ, Cuijpers I, Heymans S, Jones EAV. Cellular and Molecular
- 19 Differences between HFpEF and HFrEF: A Step Ahead in an Improved Pathological
- 20 Understanding. *Cells.* 2020;9(1).
- 21 36. Streng KW, Nauta JF, Hillege HL, Anker SD, Cleland JG, Dickstein K, et al.
- 22 Non-cardiac comorbidities in heart failure with reduced, mid-range and preserved
- 23 ejection fraction. *Int J Cardiol.* 2018;271:132-9.
- 24 37. Tromp J, Teng TH, Tay WT, Hung CL, Narasimhan C, Shimizu W, et al. Heart failure
- 25 with preserved ejection fraction in Asia. *Eur J Heart Fail.* 2019;21(1):23-36.
- 26 38. Smith GL, Masoudi FA, Vaccarino V, Radford MJ, Krumholz HM. Outcomes in
- 27 heart failure patients with preserved ejection fraction: mortality, readmission, and
- 28 functional decline. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2003;41(9):1510-8.
- 29 39. Masoudi FA, Havranek EP, Smith G, Fish RH, Steiner JF, Ordin DL, et al. Gender,
- 30 age, and heart failure with preserved left ventricular systolic function. *Journal of the*
- 31 *American College of Cardiology.* 2003;41(2):217-23.
- 32 40. Lam CS, Roger VL, Rodeheffer RJ, Bursi F, Borlaug BA, Ommen SR, et al. Cardiac
- 33 structure and ventricular-vascular function in persons with heart failure and
- 34 preserved ejection fraction from Olmsted County, Minnesota. *Circulation.*
- 35 2007;115(15):1982-90.
- 36 41. Borlaug BA, Lam CS, Roger VL, Rodeheffer RJ, Redfield MM. Contractility and
- 37 ventricular systolic stiffening in hypertensive heart disease insights into the
- 38 pathogenesis of heart failure with preserved ejection fraction. *J Am Coll Cardiol.*

- 1 2009;54(5):410-8.
- 2 42. Lakatta EG. Cardiovascular regulatory mechanisms in advanced age. *Physiol Rev.*
- 3 1993;73(2):413-67.
- 4 43. Kamon D, Sugawara Y, Soeda T, Okamura A, Nakada Y, Hashimoto Y, et al.
- 5 Predominant subtype of heart failure after acute myocardial infarction is heart failure
- 6 with non-reduced ejection fraction. *ESC Heart Fail.* 2021;8(1):317-25.
- 7 44. Ho JE, Lyass A, Lee DS, Vasan RS, Kannel WB, Larson MG, et al. Predictors of
- 8 new-onset heart failure: differences in preserved versus reduced ejection fraction.
- 9 *Circ Heart Fail.* 2013;6(2):279-86.

10

11

Table 1.

Comparisons of clinical characteristics of patients in the different HF groups

according to ejection fraction.

	No HF (n=4654)	HFpEF (n=2374)	HFrEF (n=1330)	p-value*
Male sex	58.5%	47.2% [†]	68.6% [‡]	<0.001
Age	69.94±13.717	73.92± 25.6 [†]	68.45±14.393 [‡]	<0.001
History of stroke	858 (18.4%)	503 (21.2%) [†]	243 (18.3%)	0.014
Stroke	984 (21.1%)	715 (30.1%) [†]	350 (26.3%) [‡]	<0.001
Hypertension	2902 (62.4%)	1797 (75.7%) [†]	868 (65.3%)	<0.001
Diabetes Mellitus	1311 (28.2%)	916 (38.6%) [†]	559 (42.0%) [‡]	<0.001
Coronary arterial disease	1390 (29.9%)	882 (37.2%) [†]	685 (51.5%) [‡]	<0.001
Myocardial infarction	349 (7.5%)	238 (10.0%) [†]	294 (22.1%) [‡]	<0.001
Peripheral arterial disease	222 (4.8%)	195 (8.2%) [†]	97 (7.3%) [‡]	<0.001
End stage renal disease	337 (7.2%)	380 (16.0%) [†]	226 (17.0%) [‡]	<0.001

Mean CHADSVASC score	2.52±1.513	4.08±1.502 [†]	3.83±1.571 [‡]	<0.001
-------------------------	------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	--------

Any oral anticoagulation	1348 (29.0%)	722 (30.4%)	416 (31.3%)	0.186
-----------------------------	--------------	-------------	-------------	-------

p*: p-values for comparison between the three groups

[†]: p-value<0.05 for HFpEF group compared to no HF group

[‡]: p-value<0.05 for HFrEF group compared to no HF group

Table 2.

Hazard ratios (HRs) for heart failure as a whole (CHF) vs no CHF, heart failure with preserved ejection fraction (HFpEF) vs no HF and heart failure with reduced ejection fraction (HFrEF) vs. no HF for stroke event during long term follow up.

	HR	95.0% CI for HR		p-value
		Lower	Upper	
CHF vs no CHF	1.358	1.245	1.481	<0.001
HFpEF vs no CHF	1.425	1.294	1.569	<0.001
HFrEF vs no CHF	1.238	1.096	1.399	0.001
HFpEF vs HFrEF	1.151	1.013	1.308	0.031

CHF: Congestive heart failure; HFpEF: Heart failure with preserved ejection fraction; HFrEF:

Heart failure with reduced ejection fraction

Table 3.

Results of multivariate adjusted cox regression with other risk factors of stroke


Variables	HR	95.0% CI for HR		p-value
		Lower	Upper	
Sex (female vs male)	1.102	1.007	1.206	0.035 [†]
History of Stroke	13.115	11.928	14.42	<0.001 [†]
Hypertension	1.461	1.307	1.633	<0.001 [†]
Diabetes Mellitus	1.107	1.01	1.213	0.03 [†]
Coronary arterial disease	1.074	0.975	1.183	0.15
Myocardial infarction	1.207	1.054	1.382	0.006 [†]
Peripheral arterial disease	1.153	0.989	1.345	0.07
Age	1.003	0.999	1.007	0.126
No HF vs HFrEF	0.836	0.737	0.948	0.005 [†]
HFpEF vs HFrEF	1.001	0.877	1.142	0.994

[†]: p-value<0.05; §: with HFrEF as reference

Figure 1. Comparison of ischemic stroke rates in patients with no heart failure, HFrEF, and HFpEF.

Figure Legend

During long term follow-up, HFpEF group had the highest rate of ischemic stroke, significantly higher than that of patients in HFrEF group ($p=0.031$).




HF= heart failure; HFrEF= heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; HFpEF=heart failure with preserved ejection fraction



Figure 2. Comparison of ischemic stroke rates stratified by CHA2DS2-VASc score

Figure Legend

When stratified by CHA2DS2-VASc score, the difference in ischemic stroke rate between HFrEF and HFpEF was no longer observed. (p=0.216, 0.853, 0.244 for CHA2DS2-VASc score 0-2, 3-5, and >5 respectively). Of note, the Kaplan-Meier curves were closest in the 3-5 category, in which had the majority of patients.



CHA2DS2-VASc score	Percentage of HF patients
0-2	18.9%
3-5	64.2%
>5	17%



HF= heart failure; HFrEF= heart failure with reduced ejection fraction; HFpEF=heart failure with preserved ejection fraction